

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and remarks. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7, which are independent, are hereby amended to include the features of claims 6 and 12, respectively. Claims 6 and 12 are canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Office Action stated that the Information Disclosure Statement failed to provide a legible copy of each document cited. Applicants' attorney has reviewed the file and found legible copies of the documents that were crossed out on the submitted PTO form 1449. Applicants' attorney is re-submitting, herewith, copies of the documents not considered previously. Consideration of these documents and return of an initialed copy of the 1449 are respectfully requested.

III. DRAWINGS

The Office Action objected to the drawings as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants respectfully direct attention to pages 7-11 of the Specification, where Figure 1 is discussed. Applicants submit that each claimed structural feature is described in relation to Figure 1. For example, the receiving means is described as antenna (1); the extracting function is performed by the DSP (14); the storing function is performed by the memory (14A); etc. Thus, Applicants submit that the objection to the drawings is improper and should be removed.

IV. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Specification was objected to because of the format of the Abstract. The Abstract is hereby amended, thereby obviating the objection.

V. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 was rejected because of the phrase “said transport stream”. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that claim 1 recites a “transport stream” and a “transport stream packet”. Therefore, there is proper antecedent basis for each term and the claim is not vague or indefinite. Applicants respectfully request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

VI. ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

Claims 6 and 12 were indicated as allowable. Claims 6 and 12 have been incorporated into claims 1 and 7, respectively. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 7 are allowable.

VII. DEPENDENT CLAIMS


The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800